

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 15-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-42 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4, 6, 15-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-42 currently stand rejected, and claims 1, 2, 6, 16-20, 25, 29, and 33 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 6, 15-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-42 are respectfully requested in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for her time and consideration during the telephonic interview of August 6, 2009. During the interview, the parties discussed the current rejections to the claims and the references applied therein. Applicants presented an amendment to the claims to separately recite an identifier in the map files. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment would require further search and consideration, and Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with this discussion.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 14-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat Pub 2005/0232111 to Sawabe et al. ("Sawabe") in view of US Pat 6,181,872 to Yamane ("Yamane"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

With regard to claim 1, Applicants initially submit that claim 1 has been amended to recite “the navigation list file is separate from the map file and the stream files.” The PGCI of Sawabe, which the Examiner applies for the recited “navigation list file,” includes video cell #N, which the Examiner applies as the recited “map file.” *See* Sawabe, ¶ [0176], FIG. 7. Because claim 10 now recites that the navigation list file is separate from the map file, **the navigation list file cannot include the map files.** Thus, because the PGCI includes the video cells, Sawabe does not teach the recited separate navigation list files and maps files in claim 1 as amended.

Further, the VOB set storing a flag VOB_Fm in Yamane, which the Examiner applies as the recited “navigation data item” storing a flag, is the only area that Yamane stores video data. *See* Yamane, FIG. 27, p. 38, l. 48 – p. 39, l. 19. In this way, the VOB set of Yamane may be fairly interpreted as the recited “transport stream files” in which received video data is stored. Because claim 10 now recites that the stream file is separate from the navigation list files including the navigation data item, **the stream files cannot include the flags stored in the navigation data item in the navigation list file.** Thus, because the VOB_FM of Yamane is included in the VOB set, Yamane does not teach the recited separate flags and stream files in claim 1 as amended.

Because Sawabe, alone or in combination with Yamane, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 as amended, these references cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1. Claims 16-20 have been amended to recite similar features in combination as discussed above with regard to

claim 1 and are thus also allowable over Sawabe and Yamane. Claims 2-4, 6, 14, 16, 21, 22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-42 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-4, 6, 14-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the above stated reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims 1-4, 6, 15-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36-42 in the instant application are earnestly solicited. In the event that any matters remain at issue in the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By


Terry L. Clark, Reg. No. 32,644
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

RA
TLC/REA: tlt